

**FILED**

**DEC 04 2017**

Clerk, U.S. District Court  
District Of Montana  
Missoula

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA  
MISSOULA DIVISION

JORDAN KEEFE,

Petitioner,

vs.

MICHAEL FLETCHER, ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF THE STATE OF  
MONTANA,

Respondent.

Cause No. CV 17-136-M-DLC-JCL

FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED  
STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This case comes before the Court on Petitioner Jordan Keefe's application for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. §2254, filed September 25, 2017. Keefe is a state prisoner proceeding pro se.

**I. Background**

Keefe's petition challenges his state convictions for Criminal Endangerment and Sexual Intercourse without Consent, but did not use this Court's standard form. Because it was unclear whether or not Keefe actually intended to file in this Court, or if his application was meant for filing in state court, Keefe was directed to file an Amended Petition using this Court's standard form. (Doc. 5). Keefe timely filed an Amended Petition. (Doc. 6).

Following review of Keefe's Amended Petition, the Court determined that Keefe's petition was likely time-barred and procedurally defaulted. Keefe was ordered to show cause as to why his petition should not be dismissed and was directed to the ways in which he might make such a showing. (Doc. 8 at 5-7). Keefe filed a motion for extension of time requesting an additional fifteen days to respond to this Court's order. (Doc. 9). Keefe's request was granted and his response was to be filed on or before November 17, 2017. (Doc. 10). Keefe has yet to respond to the Order.

## **II. Dismissal for Failure to Prosecute**

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure apply in a habeas action to the extent they are not inconsistent with the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts or other applicable law. See Rule 11, Section 2254 Rules; *Mayle v. Felix*, 545 U.S. 644, 654 (2005). Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) authorizes the Court to dismiss an action "[i]f the plaintiff fails to prosecute" the action. The Court may dismiss a case on its own motion without awaiting a defense motion. See, e.g., *Link v. Wabash Railroad Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 633 (1962); *Hells Canyon Preservation Council v. United States Forest Serv.*, 403 F. 3d 683, 689 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).

In determining whether Petitioner's failure to prosecute warrants dismissal of the case, the Court must weigh the following five factors: "(1) the public's

interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions.” *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988) (quoting *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.1986)). “The first two of these factors favor the imposition of sanctions in most cases, while the fourth factor cuts against a default or dismissal sanction. Thus the key factors are prejudice and availability of lesser sanctions.” *Wanderer v. Johnson*, 910 F.2d 652, 656 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.1990).

“The public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation always favors dismissal.” *Yourish v. California Amplifier*, 191 F. 3d 983, 990 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999). Despite being granted an extension seeking a specific timeline, Keefe has failed to file his response within the requested timeframe. This factor weighs in favor of dismissal.

Likewise, the second factor supports dismissal. “The trial judge is in the best position to determine whether the delay in a particular case interferes with docket management and the public interest.” *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F. 3d 639 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002). The Court cannot manage its docket if Keefe refuses to comply with Court’s orders. Keefe’s case has consumed judicial resources time that could have been better spent on other matters. Therefore, this factor favors dismissal.

The third factor requires the Court to weigh the risk of prejudice to the Defendants. “To prove prejudice, a defendant must establish that plaintiff’s actions impaired defendant’s ability to proceed to trial or threatened to interfere with the rightful decision of the case.” *Malone v. United States Postal Service*, 833 F. 2d 128, 131 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987). Mr. Keefe’s refusal to comply with the Court’s order makes prejudice a foregone conclusion. The longer this matter sits, the more prejudice to Defendants.

The Court has considered less drastic alternatives. Alternatives may include “allowing further amended complaints, allowing additional time, or insisting that appellant associate experienced counsel.” *Nevijel v. North Coast Life Insurance Co.*, 651 F. 2d 671, 674 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981). Although less drastic alternatives to dismissal should be considered, the Court is not required to exhaust all such alternatives prior to dismissal. *Id.* Mr. Keefe was afforded the opportunity to amend his petition and was given a filing extension for an amount of time he requested. Mr. Keefe has not responded to the Court’s show cause order. At this juncture, the Court can envision no further alternatives to dismissal.

The last factor weighs against dismissal because public policy favors disposition of cases on their merits. *Hernandez v. City of El Monte*, 138 F. 3d 393, 399 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998). But in light of the other four factors favoring dismissal, the weight of this factor is slight. The Court will therefore recommend that this matter

be dismissed for failure to prosecute, pursuant to Fed. F. Civ. P. 41(b). Mr. Keefe has failed to comply with the Court's order.

### **III. Certificate of Appealability**

"The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant." Rule 11(a), Rules governing § 2254 Proceedings. A COA should issue as to those claims on which a petitioner makes a "substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied if "jurists of reason could disagree with the district court's resolution of [the] constitutional claims" or "conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further." *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)). Where a claim is dismissed on procedural grounds, the court must also decide whether "jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (quoting *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

None of the claims advanced by Keefe appear to make a substantial showing that he was deprived of a constitutional right. No reasonable jurist would suggest the Court go forward with the case without Keefe's participation. A certificate of appealability should be denied because reasonable jurists would find no reason to encourage further proceedings.

Based on the foregoing, the Court enters the following:

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. Mr. Keefe's Amended Petition (Doc. 6) should be DISMISSED under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) for failure to prosecute.
2. The Clerk of Court should be directed to enter, by separate document, a judgment in favor of Respondent and against Petitioner.
3. A certificate of appealability should be DENIED.

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT  
TO FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION  
AND CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO OBJECT**

Mr. Keefe may object to this Findings and Recommendation within 14 days.<sup>1</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Failure to timely file written objections may bar a de novo determination by the district judge and/or waive the right to appeal.

Mr. Keefe must immediately notify the Court of any change in his mailing address by filing a "Notice of Change of Address." Failure to do so may result in dismissal of this action without notice to him.

DATED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2017.

/s/ Jeremiah C. Lynch  
Jeremiah C. Lynch  
United States Magistrate Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 6(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that "[w]hen a party may or must act within a specified time after being served and service is made under Rule 5(b)(2)(C) (mail) . . . 3 days are added after the period would otherwise expire under Rule 6(a)." Therefore, since Keefe is being served by mail, he is entitled an additional three (3) days after the period would otherwise expire.